I N D E X Of WITNESSES

Defense' Witnesses	Page
Stahmer, Heinrich (resumed)	24500
Cross by Mr. Tavenner (cont'd)	24500
MORNING RECESS	24517
Cross by Mr. Tavenner (cont'd)	24518
NOON RECESS	24533
Cross by Mr. Tavenner (cont'd)	24534
Redirect by Mr. Cunningham	24552
AFTERNOON RECESS	24554
Redirect by Mr. Cunningham (cont'd)	24554
(Witness avoused)	24560

I N D E X Of WITNESSES

Defense' Witnesses	Page
Stahmer, Heinrich (resumed)	24500
Cross by Mr. Tavenner (cont'd)	24500
MORNING RECESS	24517
Cross by Mr. Tavenner (cont'd)	24518
NOON RECESS	24533
Cross by Mr. Tavenner (cont'd)	24534
Redirect by Mr. Cunningham	24552
AFTERNOON RECESS	24554
Redirect by Mr. Cunningham (cont'd)	24554
(Witness evoused)	24560

INDEX

Of

EXHIBITS

	Doc.	Def.	Pros.	Description	For Ident.	Evidence
4047	2746		German Text of a Memorandum to Weizsaecker dated			
				28 August 1939 from Stahmer		24504

Tuesday, 17 June 1947

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

16

15 16

.17

18

19.

20

21

22

2.1

25

INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL
FOR THE FAR EAST
Court House of the Tribunal
War Ministry Building
Tokyo, Japan

The Tribunal met, pursuant to adjournment, at 0930.

Appearances:

For the Tribunal, all Members sitting, with the exception of: HONORABLE JUSTICE E. H. NORTHCROFT, Member from the Dominion of New Zealand, not sitting from 0930 to 1600 and HONORABLE JUSTICE JU-AO MEI, Member from the Republic of China, not sitting from 0930 to 1045.

For the Prosecution Section, same as before. For the Defense Section, same as before.

(English to Japanese and Japanese to English interpretation was made by the Language Section, IMTFE.) Morse & Lefler

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, Counselor.

MR. KANZAKI: I have heard, as a most reliable report, that HARADA, Kumakichi has recently been executed. He was formerly Chief of the Special Service Organ in Nanking and was later Commander in Chief of the Japanese forces in Java. He was to be one of the most important witnesses in the Chinese phase, the Pacific phase, and the individual phases. The appearance of HARADA before this court as a witness has already been requested by the defense and the Court has already issued a subpoena for his appearance. Since he was not permitted to appear here during the Chinese phase, I requested the authorities concerned to permit his appearance several times.

Now, not only has he not obeyed the subpoena, but he has finally been executed. I believe this is a grave infringement on the authority of this Tribunal. The Tribunal has often stated that the best evidence should be forthcoming in this historic trial --

THE PRESIDENT: Now, we have heard enough from you. I want you to tell me whom you mean by "the authorities concerned." You say you approached them and they would do nothing. I can not approach

The authorities concerned the authorities concerned. would probably be the Chinese Government or some other governments. I can only approach the Supreme Commander, and then by way of subpoena, and I have not heard his side of the story. You are, in effect, pronouncing judgment 7 without hearing both sides. All the subpoenas issued 8 by the Tribunal, and I signed them, are directed to 9 the Supreme Commander who alone can tell me, and tell 10 you, and tell the Tribunal, what the position is. 11 Only the Supreme Commander has contacts with the 12 people outside Japan; you have none, the Tribunal has 13 mone, and I have none. I suggest you approach me in Chambers and tell 15 me your story, and I shall repeat it to the Supreme 16 commander. And, if necessary, we will then state in open court the facts as we have ascertained them. 18 MR. KANZAKI: Thank you, sir. 19 THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Tavenner. 20 22 23

24

HEINRICH STAHMER, called as a witness on behalf of the defense, resumed the stand and testified as follows:

CROSS-EXAMINATION

MR. TAVENNER: If the Tribunal please.

BY MR. TAVENNER (Continued)

Q At the close of the session yesterday, Mr. Stahmer, we were talking about the notification of OSHIMA of the conclusion of the German-Russian Pact. Where is Berghof, B-E-R-G-H-O-F?

A Do you mean Berghof?

Q B-E-R-G-H-O-F.

A That was the name of the house where Hitler lived very often, near Bertchesgaden.

Q Did Ribbentrop call OSHIMA from Berghof on the evening of August 21, 1939?

A I do not know if he called him.

Q On the night of the following day, August 22, did the Secretary of State, Weizsaecker, have a conference with Ambassador OSHIMA on the matter of the conclusion of the non-aggression pact?

I do not know. The only think I know is that I got the order, and I forget the exact date, to tell OSHIMA that the German-Russian Non-Aggression Agreement was signed. I had nothing more to do in any way with this whole thing.

•

Do you not know that on the night of August the 22nd that there was a discussion between Weizsacker and OSHIMA in which Weizsacker explained the reasons for the pact and OSHIMA his objections to it, at the end of which OSHIMA assured Weizsacker of his unchanged intention to continue working for German-Japanese friendship notwithstanding the non-aggression pact?

A No, I do not know.

Q ell, did you learn of it or hear of it?

A No, I did not hear of it.

Q Do you recall any other instance shortly after the conclusion of the non-aggression pact in which Ambassador OSHIMA gave his assurance that he would continue to work for an improvement of German-Japanese relations?

A I really cannot remember. I was most of the following time not in Berlin but in Salzburg.

Q Let me see if I can refresh your recollection. Do you recall a conversation between you and OSHIMA on or prior to August 28, 1939, in which he gave you information regarding General ABE, the new Japanese Prime Minister, and among other things stated that he and General ABE served together on the general staff and that General ABE at one time was acting military

attache in Berlin? Do you recall that Ambassador OSHIMA gave you that information?

A That is possible but I do not remember it, and in the end that is now about eight years ago and I had many conversations with many different people.

Q Possibly I can refresh your recollection further about it. Do you recall that Ambassador OSHIMA advised you that General ABE should be considerably more favorable as Prime Minister than HIRANUMA and that he would furnish you later with information about other members of the cabinet?

A That is possible but I do not remember any details.

THE PRESIDENT: If you are referring to an exhibit, just mention the number, Mr. Tavenner. It will be helpful.

MR. TAVENNER: I am not referring to an exhibit.

Q Do you recall that you had a conference with OSHIMA regarding the new cabinet?

A I even cannot remember that.

Q Now do you recall whether Ambassador OSHIMA advised you that the Japanese press was gradually returning to reason and not to take the press articles too seriously? Does that refresh your recollection?

2

1

5

4

8

7

9

11 12

13

14

15 16

17 18

19

20 21

22

A I am sorry. I cannot remember.

Q Did Ambassador OSHIMA advise you that he was working as before with all his power on the maintenance and improvement of Japanese-German relations?

that ambassador OSHIMA still was a friend of Germany. The only thing I remember of the whole time, that was a farewell lunch of Ribbentrop where I saw him the last time in Germany and there were short, formal speeches exchanged of which I do not remember the contents.

THE PRESIDENT: This is a matter I feel constrained to mention from the Bench. It amounts to contempt of court.

The Chinese Judge is not here this morning because his driver was called up without telling him. The Member from China was left to his own resources to get another car, but he failed to get one in time to enable him to be here this morning.

Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Q	I ha	and you	the Germ	an text	of a	memoran	dum
allege	aly pro	epared i	for Weizs	aecker,	bearin	ng date	August
28, 19	39, pu	rported:	ly signed	by you	, and	ask you	if
that i	s your	signati	ire.				

(Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.)

Q Is that your signature?

A Yes, that is my signature.

MR. TAVENNER: I desire to offer in evidence prosecution document 4047 presented to the witness for his identification.

If the Tribunal please, this document has not been processed, but it will be processed and copies delivered to doffense counsel and to the Tribunal as soon as it can be done.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document

4047 will receive exhibit No. 2746.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution exhibit No. 2746 and received in evidence.)

MI. TAVENNER: I will read in evidence exhibit 2746.

"Berlin, 28 August 1939

"Note for State Secretary Von Weizsaecker

23

"Ambassador OSHIMA informed me about the personality of the new Japanese Prime Minister as follows:

"General ABE is 64 years of age and has had an excellent military career. He is an artillery man and served together with OSHIMA on the General Staff.

Mr. ABE belonged, furthermore, for a long period of time, as a captain to a German Artillery Regiment in Thorn, and was acting as military attache in Berlin.

"OSHIMA is a personal friend of General
ABE and believes that he is considerably more favorable
as Prime Minister than the present Prime Minister,
Baron HIRANUMA. The Ambassador will get information
about the other members of the cabinet which have been
named up to now, War Minister ISOGAI and Navy Minister
JOCHIDA, and will inform me then.

"OSHIMA informed me further that in his opinion the Japanese Press is gradually returning to reason, and asked not to take the articles in the Press too tragically, /and that/ he is working as before, with all his powers, on the maintenance and improvement of German-Japanese relations.

"/Signed/ STAHMER"

Q Was not Ribbentrop advised on or before the 26th day of August 1939 that although the Japanese army

7 8

4

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

was hard hit by the surprising Russian part, the leader of the army was exerting himself most strongly for a military alliance with Germany?

- A At what time should that have been?
- Q On or before the 26th day of August 1939.
- A I do not remember.

THE PRESIDENT: A Member of the Tribunal is interested in knowing whether the telegram was written by the witness personally or drafted by a subordinate and only signed by the witness. Answer, please, Witness.

THE WITNESS: This was no telegram, but only a memorandum note given over to the Secretary of State. I do not remember if I dictated that. Normally I let my secretary write these notes and gave him some short indications what he should write, and then I signed it if it was right.

Q The information contained in that memorandum for Weizsaecker was, in fact, furnished by you, was it not?

A Yes.

Q I referred to information being given Ribbentrop on August the 26th 1939. Was Ribbentrop also advised at that time that the army was striving, that is the army in Japan, for a change of cabinet in the direction of closer relations with Germany, and that

20

22

21

23 24

2

3

4

7

they were awaiting concrete German proposals? I do not know. Was not a suggestion made to Ribbentrop at this time by Ambassador Ott and Military Attache MATSUKI that the German armed forces issue an early declaration of sympathy for the Japanese army in order to strengthen 6 their pro-German army policy? 8 That is possible, but I did not see that tele-9 gram. 10 Were you told that that had occurred? Do you 11 recall that you learned of that fact? 12 No, I was not told of the fact. 13 What do you mean when you say it was possible? Q 14 I mean I cannot say that such a telegram did A 15 not exist: I can only say that I do not know it. 16 Were you told about it? 17 No, I cannot remember. 18 Did you learn of the conference in September 19 1939 between Ribbentrop and OSHIMA in which Ribbentrop 20 expressed the view that close cooperation between 21 Germany, Italy and Japan was not in the least dead, 22 to which statement OSHIMA agreed? 23

I do not remember this conference. But I

remember that Ribbentrop told me in that time that

the cooperation between Japan, Germany and Italy must

go on if possible, and must be strengthened.

And were you not likewise told that OSHIMA

agreed to that?

That is possible, but I cannot recollect it.

Mk. TAVENNER: That question is based on

prosecution exhibit 507, pages 6128 and 6129 of the

transcript.

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

21

22

24

25

Q Is it not a fact that Ribbentrop considered it of great importance for his policy that OSHIMA remain as ambassador in Berlin, and that OSHIMA enjoyed the complete confidence of Hitler and the German Army?

A I had always the impression that Ribbentrop liked OSHIMA very much, and I heard that Hitler did the same. How the position of OSHIMA was concerned with the German Army, I do not know; but I believe that he was on quite good terms with them, too, having been military attache several times.

Q Did Ribbentrop tell you that the presence of OSHIMA in Germany was very necessary for the German policy?

A I remember only that he told me once that it was very bad and that he was very sorry that OSHIMA had to go away.

Q Will you please answer my question?

A I do not remember what you told -- what you asked me.

Q Do you know it is a fact that Ribbentrop considered it necessary for the extension of his policy that Ambassador OSHIMA remain in Germany?

THE PRESIDENT: You better put the words of the telegram if you are referring to exhibit 507.

According to that telegram, Ribbentrop said, "I deem it to be of great importance for the policy I have in mind that OSHIMA remain Ambassador," not that it is necessary.

Q Do you recall that Ribbentrop stated that it was of importance, of great importance, for the policy he had in mind that OSHIMA remain ambassador in Berlin?

A I do not remember that he told me so.

Q Mr. Stahmer, was it not a fact well known to you from your access to the records in the German Foreign Office that OSHIMA and SHIRATORI continued, after the non-aggression pact was concluded, to promote a German-Japanese alliance?

A I had the impression that OSHIMA, and I believe that SHIRATORI, too, would always work to keep up and even to embetter German-Japanese relations. But I did not get the idea that they were going on to work for the alliance. And as I told yesterday, I had no full access to the files of the German Foreign Office. I only got some telegrams from Ribbentrop when I had to work.

Q By whom was the Duke of Koburg chosen for the trip to Japan and the United States?

A Ribbentrop told me in January 1940 that at

first the general manager of the I.G. should be sent.

But he believed that was wrong, and then he told me the Duke of Koburg had to go. I do not know if it was the idea of Ribbentrop or the idea of Hitler. And he asked me, because I had worked together with the Duke of Koburg, and I told him I believed that was a very good idea because the cuke has been in Japan and in the United States before.

Q Do you mean that you were recommended or selected by Ribbentrop?

A You mean the Duke of Koburg?

Q I mean you.

A I got the order to accompany the duke on that trip because we had worked together since 1935, and I remember that the duke asked Ribbentrop to give the permit to accompany him, the permission to accompany him.

Q My question was whether or not Ribbentrop recommended or selected you for this trip to Japan with Koburg.

A Of course; and he told me and he gave me the order to accompany him.

Q Ribbentrop was your immediate superior at that time, was he not?

A Yes, he was.

9

10

1

2

11 12

13

14

16

17 18

19

20

22

23 24

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Is it true that the Luke of Koburg was a very old man and was not interested in diplomacy at this time? Well, he was not a very old man. He must have been at that time 47 or 48 -- 57 or 58. On the other hand, you were the political and diplomatic adviser of Ribbentrop, weren't you? A No, I was not the political and diplomatic adviser of Ribbentrop. Had not you been his main adviser in politics and diplomacy for a number of years? No. That is absolutely wrong. I have not been his main adviser in politics or diplomatics for several years. If not the main advisor, you were, nevertheless, one of his advisers? No, I was none of his advisers. I was one of his employees and I worked with him and under him.

Greenberg & Reichers

1

2

3

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q Well, tell us the character of your employment.

A I got an order from Ribbentrop, for instance, to become liaison man with OSHIMA, and then I had to fill out my work, -- but an adviser is a man who tells his superior how to do this and how to do that, and who makes him political and diplomatic proposals.

That's what I never did.

Q How many different countries had Ribbentrop sent you to on diplomatic missions?

A On diplomatic missions I was sent to Italy; then, in this ex-service men work; I was sent to England and France, and twice in Hungary; and then I was sent with the Duke of Coburg to Japan and the United States.

Q When you state, Section 5, page 5 of your affidavit, that there was no political purpose pursued in the trip of the Duke of Coburg to the United States in 1940, did you intend to imply that there was no political purpose in your accompanying him?

A I really had absolutely no political order except that I should use this opportunity to see how situation in Japan is. That was all.

Q Then I understand there was a political purpose in your trip to Japan?

2

6 7

5

8 0

10 11

12 13

14 15

16 17

18 19

20

21 22

23 24

25

Well, I would not call that a political order, but that is a difference of opinion.

If this were not a trip for political purposes, what was the purpose of your trip?

The trip to Japan was absolutely secondary. The only important thing was the trip to the United States, and we wanted to do everything to keep up friendship with the American Red Cross because there was no other way to travel via Siberia. And we used this opportunity especially to make this congratulatory mission to the Emperor of Japan on the occasion of the 2,600 years anniversary, to avoid to send over a special commission later.

Then do I understand correctly that one political purpose of your trip was to lay the groundwork for commissions that were to follow?

No, that is not right. I did not have the idea or the order to lay any groundwork at all here.

Now, you stated that the trip to Japan was purely a secondary matter, that the real object of your trip was to go to the United States; but you have stated in your affidavit that there was no political purpose for your trip to the United States.

A Yes, and I still believe that cannot be

called a political purpose because we avoided everything which could be used for political propaganda,
or which could make the impression that we had any
political work to do. We even went so far to refuse
money which was offered to us for the German Red Cross,
to prevent making the impression of collecting money.

Q Did you learn before your trip to Japan that Ribbentrop had advised Ambassador Ott that Ambassador OSHIMA, after his return, would do further work for the German-Japanese friendship and that Ribbentrop requested that the German Embassy facilities be extended to OSHIMA for the transmittal in code of telegrams delivered there by OSHIMA for Ribbentrop personally:

A I did not hear it that time, but I read it later in the documents of the Embassy after I had to take over the Embassy.

Q Then you read and studied the files in the German Embassy in Japan after you arrived here?

A I studied some --- very few of this old file.

Q You carefully selected those that you would read and those that you would not be informed about, is that it?

A No, that was not the idea, but in this

. .

case I was very much interested who had any right to use telegram possibilities and cypher possibilities. That was the reason why I studied these.

Q And you mean to state that as the employee of Ribbentrop, whose business was diplomacy, you did not look at the telegrams on file there to see what was going on diplomatically?

A You mean in the time when I was in Berlin?

Q No, we are speaking now of the Embassy files in Japan, which you say you had access to.

A Well, I had to work every day and I did not have the time to study all these old files. For my recreation I took some files out concerning the time after -- before the war, 1914. On the other hand, my secretary can always be witness and state what I studied or not.

Q Do you seriously state, Mr. Stahmer, that you came to Japan to find out the then present-day conditions and then you read only the files of the German Embassy relating to the war of 1914?

A No, I do not want to state that. I said
I had taken out those old files to study them as a
sort of recreation, but I want to say that I did
not study all those files from 1938 to 1942 or 1943
or before. I always took out what I needed for my

1.

immediate work, for my work.

Q Well, when you arrived here--THE PRESIDENT: We will recess for 15 minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1045, a recess was taken until 1100, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: I give the judgment of the Tribunal on the defense motion praying for production of witnesses for cross-examination or, alternatively, to strike their affidavits.

The Tribunal will not take into consideration the evidence of Semyonav or Rodzaevsky except de bene esse the affidavits of deponents MIYAKE, KUSABE and NOHARA; orders the prosecution to produce for cross-examination the other witnesses mentioned in the said defense motion within a period of two months from this date or within such longer period as may on cause shown be approved by the Tribunal or, alternatively, to give convincing reasons within the said period why they are not able to produce the said witnesses. The Tribunal will disregard the affidavits of any one or more of the deponents last mentioned in respect of whom the prosecution fails

to comply with the present order.

As regards the decision not to take into consideration the evidence of the two first named witnesses, this decision would have been the same no matter what section of the prosecution offered the affidavits. There is no evidence justifying Major Blakeney's suggestion at page 23,791 of the transcript that duress was employed to secure the evidence. The Tribunal issued and repeats its warning

Mr. Tavenner.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

against such unwarranted assertions by counsel.

BY MR. TAVENNER (Continued):

Q Mr. Stahmer, at the time you examined the telegram in the German Embassy files on your trip to Japan in 1940 as you previously testified to, did you examine the other files of telegrams covering the period from the close of the Non-Aggression Pact to the time of your arrival?

A There must have been misunderstanding from my side. I did not study any documents in 1940. The documents I studied, that was in 1943 and 1944.

Q I at no time have asked you any question about what you did in 1944. When was it that you saw the telegram about the use of Embassy facilities for

3

6

7

9

10

11

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

the sending of messages by OSHIMA?

A That was after I had taken over the Embassy in 1943 or 1944.

Q Did not your political purpose in coming to Japan include an interview with OSHIMA and SHIRATORI whom you say you met on two occasions while in Tokyo?

I wanted very much to see them again because I knew them in Berlin and Germany, but I was very careful to make a political interview with them. I had two reasons. At first the situation between Japan and Germany at that time was not very good and there was no possibility of making progress, and the second reason was that I did not want to trouble the work of the Embassy and the ambassador here to make him difficulties in his work.

Q Let me refer back for a moment to the question of examination of the documents in the German Embassy. You say when you became ambassador that you examined those documents?

A Yes, after I became ambassador in Tokyo.

Q Did you then examine the documents from the period of the conclusion of the Non-Aggression Pact between Germany and Russia on up through 1940 during which time you found the one that you have described to us?

A No, I didn't study these documents at that time because already two years before the war between Russia and Germany had broken out and that was of no interest for my daily work.

Q Russia was not in the war at that time and weren't you bending every effort in 1943 to bring Japan into the war against Russia?

A Excuse me, I didn't quite understand it -that I should bring -- that I intended to bring Russia
into war with Japan?

Q No, that there may be no misunderstanding as to what I said I will endeavor to repeat the question.

A Thank you.

Q Were you not bending every effort in 1943 to bring Japan into war with Russia?

A No, I cannot remember a single conversation in that line because that was tried before my time and failed completely, and I knew that there was no possibility, even if I would have liked to do that, to try to get Japan into the war with Russia.

Q Do you state that you took no action after becoming Ambassador to Japan to induce Japan to attack Russia?

A No, I cannot remember a single action. I believed always that it was quite useless.

when the matter of possible war between Japan and Russia was being considered that you examine the files to study the relationship between Germany and Russia in so far as Japan was concerned?

A I have never got an order from Berlin to work in that line, and I did not believe it necessary to study these documents. I knew in the big lines the events, and the only important thing was the situation of the day.

Q On your arrival in Japan in 1940 did you discuss political matters with OSHIMA and SHIRATORI?

A No, I cannot remember. We talked over the

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1 general situation and I told them much about the war 2 in Germany and many friends, especially OSHIMA had 3 in Germany, and then, so far as I remember, we were 4 never alone.

Q Exhibit 511, page 6141 of the transcript,
is a top secret telegram of 23 February 1940, sent
from you to the State Secretary, in which you state
that upon your arrival in Japan you found OSHIMA,
SHIRATORI, and TERAUCHI in an unchanged friendly
attitude and ready for every support.

Are we to believe that you talked to OSHIMA and SHIRATORI about political matters as shown by your telegram of the 23rd or your statement to the contrary near the bottom of page 5 of your affidavit?

I did not hear your answer.

A I regarded that conversation as a general conversation over the whole situation, and of course OSHIMA, SHIRATORI, and TERAUCHI, to use this word, were always regarded as pro-German. What I call a political conversation, that is a conversation about a serious political problem or about certain political plans like that, and the report I made in that telegram was a combination of everything I heard from the Japanese whom I knew, from the people in the German Embassy, and from the German journalists.

25

Q Wasn't Ribbentrop's policy of an alliance between Germany and Japan one of the vital concerns to Germany at that time?

A That is right. At that time we saw a very small possibility, but the idea was always most important.

Q Isn't it true that the support for which OSHIMA and SHIMATORI were reported by you to be ready was not the support of the German-Japanese alliance?

I desire to correct that statement and strike out the last negative, the word "not."

A Well, I believe, from their side, they had exactly the same idea as the German side had, that the German-Japanese Alliance would be very favorable.

O And they were ready for every support on that proposal, were they not?

A I do not know what support means, but since I had the idea they were, they had the same idea, and they wanted to go on and to help, that this alliance could be made later.

Q Did you confer on political matters with persons other than OSHIMA and SHIMATORI?

A Once, I believe, at the first opportunity

I met them, the Count TERAUCHI was present, who had visited Germany in September and October, 1939, and some other people were present, too, whose names I do not remember, although they took part in that conversation.

- General TERAUCHI, or Count TERAUCHI --Q
- General Count TERAUCHI.
- He was sent to Germany by the Japanese Army, Q was he not?

I know that he was sent to Italy as sort of commission accompanied by some officers, and later he came to Germany, too.

13

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

8

11

Barton & Wolf

Q And that was immediately upon the conelusion of the Non-Aggression Pact; was it not?

A I believe he must have been in Italy already, or in Europe already beforehand.

In the 14 days in which you stayed in Japan on this particular occasion, that is, in May, 1940, your second trip --

economic spheres of Japanese life?

A Yes, I saw much more poeple that time. There
were some bigger invitations in the German Embassy
because this congratulatory mission of the Duke
of Cobalt which became official the time of the
hission, so, many high officials were present.

17 Q Did Joseph A. Meissinger, Colonel in the 18 Gestapo branch of the German police arrive in Japan 19 while you were here or shortly thereafter?

A No, he arrived about one year later as

Q Did Von Duerkheim arrive in Japan in the

23 spring of 1940, while you were here, for the purpose

24 of strengthening the cultural cooperation between

25 the two countries?

He was here in 1938. Then he went back 1 to Germany for a short time as far as I remember. 2 At any rate, he was already here when I arrived. 3. Did Helffrich, President of the Hamburg-American Shipping Lines, arrive in Japan in the spring of 1940 while you were here for the purpose of obtaining close cooperation with Japanese economic circles? He arrived sometime before I came to Japan. 10 But in the spring -- But during the year 11 1940? 12 Yes, probably in the very beginning of 13 1940. 14 When did Rheinhardt Schultze, a leader 15 in the Hitler Youth Movement, arrive in Japan? 16 17 I do not know exactly. It must have been 18 in '37 or '38. What was your official position in July, 19 20 1940? 21 In July 1940 I had the title of -- no --22 1940 I still had the title of Consul-General. 23 Were you in Japan at the time of the fall 24 of the YONAI Cabinet in July, 1940? 25 No, I was not in Japan.

 \mathcal{L}

3

5 6 7

8

10

11

12

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

24 25 Q Were you personally in communication in July 1940 with any members of the Japanese Cabinet?

A No, July 1940 I had no connection.

MR. TAVENNER: If the Tribunal please, in view of the witness' answers to the last three questions, I would like to call the Tribunal's attention to prosecution exhibits which set forth the prosecution evidenc relating to the fall of the YONAI Cabinet:

Exhibit 515, page 6,115 of the transcript; exhibit 520, page 6,162; exhibit 523, page 6,175; exhibit 529, page 6,233; exhibit 530, page 6,238; exhibit 531, page 6,239 and exhibit 532, pages 6,240, 6,243, 6,248, 6,250 and 6,254.

Q Were you not fearful that the YONAI
Cabinet would improve the Japanese relations with
the United States and England, and for that reason
did you not desire that the YONAI Cabinet be replaced
by one more favorable to Germany?

A Oh, of course I would have liked to have the YONAI Government replaced if it is for a more favorable government for Germany.

Q Did you not express the hope that it would be replaced by a new government, in fact, a government Were you personally in communication

2

3

1

4 5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22 23

24

in July 1940 with any members of the Japanese Cabinet? A No, July 1940 I had no connection.

MR. TAVENNER: If the Tribunal please, in view of the witness' answers to the last three questions, I would like to call the Tribunal's attention to prosecution exhibits which set forth the prosecution evidenc relating to the fall of the YONAI Cabinet:

Exhibit 515, page 6,115 of the transcript; exhibit 520, page 6,162; exhibit 523, page 6,175; exhibit 529, page 6,233; exhibit 530, page 6,238; exhibit 531, page 6,239 and exhibit 532, pages 6,240, 6,243, 6,248, 6,250 and 6,254.

Were you not fearful that the YONAI Cabinet would improve the Japanese relations with the United States and England, and for that reason did you not desire that the YONAI Cabinet be replaced by one more favorable to Germany?

Oh, of course I would have liked to have the YONAI Government replaced if it is for a more favorable government for Germany.

Did you not express the hope that it would be replaced by a new government, in fact, a government

under the leadership of Prince KONOYE or a group you considered to be more friendly to Germany?

A That is very possible. I only do not remember when.

MR. TAVENNER: I refer to exhibit 515, page 6,151 of the transcript as the basis for that question.

Q Did not Ambassador Ott in June, 1940, advocate Japanese annexation of Indo-China as being in the German interest, and in connection with which he assigned as the supporting reason, that the failure of Japan to accept responsibility for making such a decision would probably result in the replacement of the Cabinet by one which would be close to Germany?

A I do not know that telegram because I came back to Berlin not before, in the second half of June, and then had some time leave at home.

Q You did not review the files of the Foreign Office upon your return from vacation?

A No, I really did not and I could not without a special permission.

MR. TAVENNER: The question is based on exhibit 520, page 6,162 of the transcript.

In the last paragraph on page six of your

 affidavit, you state that you arrived in Tokyo on 7 September 1940. Is it not a fact that you arrived in Japan on the 23rd day of August, 1940?

A I assure you I arrived in Tokyo on the 7th of September, 1940, together with my wife.

Q My question was, did you arrive in Japan on the 23rd day of August.

A No, I did not arrive in Japan on the 23rd of August. I came directly via Manchukuo to Tokvo without any interruption or any stay anywhere.

Q When did you arrive in Manchukuo?

A I cannot say exactly. I believe at the 23rd of August I still must have been in Moscow or in Berlin.

Q You testified that MATSUOKA had a pact drawn up and prepared at the time of your conference on September 9. Am I correct in that recital of your testimony?

A Yes, as far as I remember, already, on the 2nd negotiation, MATSUOKA had a short draft and a sort of preamble which we talked over.

C Do you know from your conversation with MATSUOKA or other Japanese, of the action that had been taken by the Japanese Foreign Ministers!

Conference prior to your arrival with regard to the

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

decision to send you?

proposed alliance? No, I did not hear that. I did not know that. Did you learn from MATSUOKA of the various revisions of the plan that he himself proposed --THE MONITOR: Mr. Tavenner, shall we take it that he proposed the revision or the plan itself? MR. TAVENNER: Proposal of the revisions. THE MONITOR: Revisions. Q -- as early as the 4th day of September? No, I knew nothing of the revisions of the plan. He didn't tell me and he did not tell me at all that they had meetings before and talked it over. Q When was the decision reached that you should be sent from Germany to Japan? I cannot remember exactly, but it must have been the middle of August maybe -- yes, about the 15th of August, because I had to take my visa very quickly and had to take a plane to Moscow. Do you know what word had been received from Japan which led Ribbentrop to make the hasty

A No, I do not know. He only told me that he couldn't get a clear picture because the telegrams,

incoming telegrams from the German Embassy here, and the communication of Ambassador KURUSU was so unclear that he did not know how the situation really was and that he believed that it would be necessary for me to go over and try to find out.

Q In the last paragraph of page 6 of your affidavit you enumerate the matters which you explained to MATSUOKA at your meeting with him on September 9. Did you also ask that Japan join the Axis in the fullest sense of the word, and that quickly?

A When MATSUOKA asked me after we had talked over the whole situation, what would be the best way to do, I told him that my idea of the best thing would to make an alliance and a defensive alliance and to go together.

Q And you were urging that that be done quickly, did you not?

A Excuse me, I didn't --

And you urged that that be done quickly, did you not?

A Oh, that is possible, but that has another reason. The Ambassador KURUsU in Berlin asked me how long I wanted to stay in Tokyo, and, of course, I didn't know what to say and the whole situation

7 8

was -- and I said "Well, I don't know, maybe 3
or 4 weeks." He cabled that to Tokyo and that was
the reason why MATSUOKA believed it must be done
so very quickly. He told me that later. I did
not tell him it was so very, very necessary.

Q Do I understand you to say then, that you did not call upon Japan to join the Axis quickly?

A Oh, it is very possible that I said "That is just the time to do that." That is very possible. I do not remember the wording.

Q Did you also state that Germany was taking a long view of carrying on the stupendous struggle against Anglo-Saxondom, including America, and that this great struggle would go on for tens of years in one form or another?

A I told MATSUOKA that we in Germany must be prepared for a very long war against France and England, and that we want to do everything to keep the United States out of the war.

Q Now, will you please answer my question? Did you make the statement that I recited to you?

A I did not make the statement as far as the United States is concerned, and I cannot remember if I said how long this war would probably be --- go on.

Morse & Lefler

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

AFTERNOON SESSION

The Tribunal met, pursuant to recess, at 1330.

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International

Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Tavenner.

HEINRICH STAHMER, called as a witness on behalf of the defense, resumed the stand and testified as follows:

MR. TAVENNER: If the Tribunal please.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. TAVENNER (Continued):

Q Mr. Stahmer, in your conversation with MATSUOKA on September 9, did you not make a request that Japan come into the Axis alliance quickly before the war against England closed?

A That is very possibly so. I do not remember the wording, but I told him that if an alliance with Germany was contemplated it must be done quickly because when the war with England was finished it would be of no help for the Japanese political situation.

Then, did you not follow with a statement that Germany was taking a long view of carrying on a stupendous struggle beyond, presumably, the close of the war with England, that the struggle would be against Anglo-Saxondom, including America, and that it would last for tens of years?

A I said, as far as I remember, that we must be prepared in Germany for a very long war, that we do not know how long this war will go on, maybe for years. And, then I emphasized that the United States must be kept out of the war, and that it would be necessary to make a platform for a coming peace. He told me the next day that he had repeated that to his prime minister.

Q You state, now, that you represented that it would be a long war?

A I said that the war in which Germany was involved already at that time would be probably a very long one.

Is that not inconsistent with your previous statement in which you were endeavoring to persuade Japan to come into the Axis quickly before the close of the war with England? Now, tell us which is right. Did you expect the war with England to be over quickly, or did you expect a long war?

A We had a long discussion. For two hours I explained to him our idea of the situation in the world, and I again told him, "Of course, it may be

possible that Germany will attack England and then this war will be ended very soon. In that case, it would be very good for Japan, if she intended to make an agreement with Germany, to do it now." That would be a good moment. Then, I said, "But, we do not know that, and we must be prepared for war which will last many years and to avoid that is the only way to try to keep the United States out of this war, and by this way make a platform for a coming peace."

I ask you again, in this connection, did you not state that Germany was taking a long view of carrying on a stupendour struggle against Anglo-Saxondom, including America?

A I do not remember the words. I only remember that I told him that we must be prepared for a very long struggle. I do not know what words I used, England or Anglo-Saxon. I really cannot remember, but I remember definitely that I said it our most important thing to keep the United States out of the war.

Q I am not asking you now what else you may have said. I asked you a specific question. Will please answer it?

A I do not remember this exact wording you said.

Q Did you also state that Germany, Italy, and Japan should stand together, knitted very closely,

possible that Germany will attack England and then this war will be ended very soon. In that case, it would be very good for Japan, if she intended to make an agreement with Germany, to do it now." That would be a good moment. Then, I said, "But, we do not know that, and we must be prepared for war which will last many years and to avoid that is the only way to try to keep the United States out of this war, and by this way make a platform for a coming peace."

I ask you again, in this connection, did you not state that Germany was taking a long view of carrying on a stupendour struggle against Anglo-Saxondom, including America?

A I do not remember the words. I only remember that I told him that we must be prepared for a very long struggle. I do not know what words I used, England or Anglo-Saxon. I really cannot remember, but I remember definitely that I said it our most important thing to keep the United States out of the war.

I am not asking you now what else you may have said. I asked you a specific question. Will please answer it?

A I do not remember this exact wording you said.

Q Did you also state that Germany, Italy, and Japan should stand together, knitted very closely,

3 4

until the great aim is achieved?

A That is possible.

Q Was that great aim to which you referred the conquering of the democratic nations, one by one, as envisaged in Hitler's Mein Kampf?

A No, I had only in mind the victory and not an attack on the different democratic countries.

Q With regard to your explanation to MATSUOKA that Germany had no intention to draw Japan into the European War, as shown in your affidavit, did not you state that Germany does not look for Japan's military assistance at this juncture -
A Yes, I told him --

Q (Continuing) -- in connection with her war against England?

A Yes, I told MATSUOKA at that time that Germany did not want Japanese military assistance in this war in Europe.

Q Did you say "did not want it at this moment"?

A That is what I do not remember. I only wanted to tell him, "We do not need your military help now, at this moment."

Q I believe you stated in your affidavit that you had no knowledge of the later effort made by Ribbentrop to induce Japan to attack Singapore, but I desire to ask you if in November, 1940, within about two months after the conclusion of the Tri-Partite Pact, KURUSU, ambassador in Germany, in a conversation with Weizsacker stated that a Russo-Japanese neutrality pact and peace between Japan and China were required prerequisites for a Japanese advance through the regions south of China, including Siam, without the

7 8

3

6

5

7 8

9

11 12

13

14

15 16

17 18

19

20 21

22

24 25 use of which Singapore could hardly be brought to a fall?

A That is very possible, but I was never present at any conversation between Weizsacker and KURUSU and I did not get a memorandum of such a meeting, and he did not talk about this idea with me.

Q Then you state you have no knowledge, either from the German or the Japanese side, of contemplated assistance by Japan in the war against England within a few months after the conclusion of the Tri-Partite Pact?

A No, I heard nothing at that time. I was rather ill and I did not work practically since December, '40, and then the only order I had was to accompany MATSUOKA when he came to Germany and stayed in Berlin, and then I got on leave -- on sick leave -- and was in Italy from immediately after the return of MATSUOKA till the end of June.

Q In your conference with MATSUOKA on September 9th, did you agree that Germany would cooperate with Japan to further Japanese aims in Greater East Asia?

A Yes. I said, "We are willing to acknowledge the Japanese position in Greater East Asia and we are willing to help with our -- in an economic and industrial line, and we hope we get raw materials from

3

5

7 8

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21 22

23

24 25 Japan in this sphere in exchange, and this would develon a very healthy economic situation later."

Q And did not that offer of aid also extend to the promise to immediately furnish Japan with materials for war such as airplanes, tanks, war tools and technicians?

A That is possible, but I do not remember how far we went into details at that time. The general idea which I told him was that Japan is a country with an undeveloped industry and Germany was a country with a very developed industry. So we were willing to help in building and development of the Japanese industry and receiving raw materials against it.

Q was it your idea to help Japan in building her industry to supply her with airplanes, tanks and war tools?

A No, that was not my idea, but I know that even in wartime Germany sold rather a lot of arms and ammunitions into other countries, even into countries who were not involved, who were neutral at the time.

Q When you said that Germany was ready to cooperate with Japan to further Japanese aims in Greater
Last Asia, you meant to furnish war materials in order
to aid Japan in her expansion program in East Asia,
did you not?

7 8

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23 24

25

a very healthy economic situation later." And did not that offer of aid also extend to the promise to immediately furnish Japan with materials for war such as airplanes, tanks, war tools

Japan in this sphere in exchange, and this would develop

and technicians?

That is possible, but I do not remember how far we went into details at that time. The general idea which I told him was that Japan is a country with an undeveloped industry and Germany was a country with a very developed industry. So we were willing to help in building and development of the Japanese industry and receiving raw materials against it.

Q Was it your idea to help Japan in building her industry to supply her with airplanes, tanks and war tools?

No, that was not my idea, but I know that even in wartime Germany sold rather a lot of arms and ammunitions into other countries, even into countries who were not involved, who were neutral at the time.

When you said that Germany was ready to cooperate with Japan to further Japanese aims in Greater hast Asia, you meant to furnish war materials in order to aid Japan in her expansion program in East Asia, did you not?

I did not have the idea to assist in this expansion idea. I only wanted to create a better economic situation between these two countries.

A better economic situation that would be acquired by the use of force. Is that what you mean?

No, that is definitely not what I mean and that is why I hoped to Minister MATSUOKA that a military sort of attack on Indo-China, during the time of my presence here, could be avoided.

D u & W h

I will ask you a question or two about that. MATSUOKA informed you, did he not, during the course of these negotiations that the Japanese army would march into North Indo-China within three days if the French did not accept Japanese demands; is that true?

A Yes, he said every governor-general of Indo-China did not accept, and sent a sharp ultimatum the army would, as far as I remember, march in within three days. He wanted me to help him to avoid that.

That was on September 20th, wasn't it?

I do not remember the exact date, but it was at that time.

Another request had been made of Ambassador Ott on August the 15th to assist the Japanese in bringing the French to terms?

That is possible, but I do not know because that was before my arrival here.

Did you request Ribbontrop to bring pressure on the French Vichy Government to accede to the Japanese demands?

I sent them a telegram implying that hostilities could be avoided here.

Then the Japanese army marched into North Indo-China, did it not?

9 10

11

12

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

14

13

16

15

17 18

19

20

21

22

23 24

Duda & Whalen

Q I will ask you a question or two about that. MATSUOKA informed you, did he not, during the course of these negotiations that the Japanese army would march into North Indo-China within three days if the French did not accept Japanese demands; is that true?

A Yes, he said every governor-general of Indo-China did not accept, and sent a sharp ultimatum the army would, as far as I remember, march in within three days. He wanted me to help him to avoid that.

Q That was on September 20th, wasn't it?

A I do not remember the exact date, but it was at that time.

Q Another request had been made of Ambassador Ott on August the 15th to assist the Japanese in bringing the French to terms?

A That is possible, but I do not know because that was before my arrival here.

Q Did you request Ribbontrop to bring pressure on the French Vichy Government to accede to the Japanese demands?

A Yes. I sent them a telegram implying that hostilities could be avoided here.

Q Then the Japanese army marched into North Indo-China, did it not?

9

10

1

2

3

4

6

7

11

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

2324

A Then I remember that M.TSUOKA told me it had helped a lot, and he was very glad that no incident had happened, and he thanked me for my help.

Q You state in the first paragraph under Section 12, page 9, of your affidavit that OSHIMA took no positive personal stand on any of the controversial issues which you discussed. Prosecution exhibit 501, page 6,096 of the transcript, which is an excerpt from Count Ciano's diary, shows that OSHIMA acting with SHIRATORI threatened to bring about a fall of the Japanese cabinet by resigning from his post unless the Japanese Government fell in line with his desire for a Japanese-German military treaty without reservations on the part of Japane.

How do you explain this inconsistency between this documentary evidence and the statement in your affidavit?

ideas which are contained in the diary of Count Ciano, and I did not see SHIRATORI at all at that time. I had the impression the whole time I worked with OSHIMA that he was already very cautious and what he told to me that was always based upon telegrams from his government, and that was, more or less, all the topic of our negotiations, of our talks. And several times when I

ment's idea, or what do you believe what will happen now, he answered "Well, I do not know, I must send a telegram and ask my government." That was my personal impression as far as I recollect.

Q I was not asking you your general impressions. I asked you how you explained the contradiction between the documentary evidence I read you and your statement in your affidavit.

A If this diary of Count Ciano is documentary evidence I cannot explain the difference. I only know what I talked over and how I talked with OSHIMA.

Q In other words, you did not know about this documentary evidence in the Count Ciano diary, is that it?

A Yes, I have read some parts of this diary of Count Ciano, not the whole.

Q Exhibit 502, page 6,100 of the transcript, is a top secret telegram from Ribbentrop to the ambassador in Japan, bearing date 26 April 1939, and shows at the beginning of March both OSHIMA and SHIRATORI received instructions from the Japanese Government with regard to the proposed pact, and that both ambassadors on their own accord immediately refused to present the Japanese proposed change of the German-Italian draft,

ment's idea, or what do you believe what is your government's idea, or what do you believe what will happen
now, he answered "Well, I do not know, I must send a
telegram and ask my government." That was my personal
impression as far as I recollect.

Q I was not asking you your general impressions.

I asked you how you explained the contradiction between the documentary evidence I read you and your statement in your affidavit.

A If this diary of Count Ciano is documentary evidence I cannot explain the difference. I only know what I talked over and how I talked with OSHIMA.

Q In other words, you did not know about this documentary evidence in the Count Ciano diary, is that it?

A Yes, I have read some parts of this diary of Count Ciano, not the whole.

Q Exhibit 502, page 6,100 of the transcript, is a top secret telegram from Ribbentrop to the ambassador in Japan, bearing date 26 April 1939, and shows at the beginning of March both OSHIMA and SHIRATORI received instructions from the Japanese Government with regard to the proposed pact, and that both ambassadors on their own accord immediately refused to present the Japanese proposed change of the German-Italian draft,

and declared that they would have to resign from their posts in the event of a different decision of the Japanese Government -- Cabinet.

3

5

How do you explain the inconsistency between this documentary evidence and the statement in your affidavit?

6 7

I cannot explain the difference. I can only repeat that OSHIMA did not tell me these ideas.

9

10

8

As intimately connected as you were with those transactions in April 1939 acting as the liaison between OSHIMA and Ribbentrop, you did not know of

12

11

this incident?

telegram.

13 14

I remember that I heard later, but that was some time later, that OSHIMA had difficulties with his government, but I was not present when he had a conversation in these lines; probably was Ribbentrop -- or

17 18

16

I do not know. And I was not asked, nor did I see this

19 20

21

22

23

24

and declared that they would have to resign from their posts in the event of a different decision of the Japanese Government -- Cabinet.

How do you explain the inconsistency between this documentary evidence and the statement in your affidavit?

A I cannot explain the difference. I can only repeat that OSHIMA did not tell me these ideas.

Q As intimately connected as you were with those transactions in April 1939 acting as the liaison between OSHIMA and Ribbentrop, you did not know of this incident?

A I remember that I heard later, but that was some time later, that OSHIMA had difficulties with his government, but I was not present when he had a conversation in these lines; probably was Ribbentrop -- or I do not know.

And I was not asked, nor did I see this telegram.

and declared that they would have to resign from their posts in the event of a different decision of the Japanese Government -- Cabinet.

How do you explain the inconsistency between this documentary evidence and the statement in your affidavit?

A I cannot explain the difference. I can only repeat that OSHIMA did not tell me these ideas.

Q As intimately connected as you were with those transactions in April 1939 acting as the liaison between OSHIMA and Ribbentrop, you did not know of this incident?

A I remember that I heard later, but that was some time later, that OSHIMA had difficulties with his government, but I was not present when he had a conversation in these lines; probably was Ribbentrop -- or I do not know.

And I was not asked, nor did I see this telegram.

According to the last-mentioned document, the Japanese ambassadors, OSHIMA and SHIRATORI, received further instructions from their government in which an earlier Japanese suggestion was retained in a weakened form. The reason assigned by the Tokyo cabinet for the necessity of the limited interpretation of the pact was stated to be the fact that Japan, for political and in particular for economic reasons, was at the moment not yet in a position to come forward openly as the opposer of the three democracies. With regard to this statement by the Japanese Government, OSHIMA and SHIRATORI informed Count Ciano and Ribbentrop that the wish of the Japanese Government was impossible.

How co you explain the inconsistency between this documentary evidence and the statement in your affidavit?

A I cannot explain that. I do not know.

In prosecution exhibit No. 2230, page 15,990 of the transcript, a confidential conversation between Ambassador Ott and von Ribbentrop is described, in which -- That is a mistake; instead of Ambassador Ott it is Ambassador OSHIMA -- in which Ambassador OSHIMA stated that he had received a telegram from Foreign Minister ARITA, according to which the Japanese Government wished to reserve entrance into a state of war in

case of a European conflict. Ambassador OSHIMA refused to officially pass this matter on to the German Government, and advised ARITA of this by telegram.

How do you explain the inconsistency between this documentary evidence and the statement in your affidavit?

A I do not know that document, and I do not know this fact.

Q Prosecution exhibit No. 506, page 6,124 of the transcript, a memorandum by Weizsaecker, bearing date 18 September 1939, shows that Ambassador OSHIMA was directed to file a protest to Germany's action in concluding the pact, but he disobeyed his government's instructions by postponing delivery of the Japanese memorandum of protest until 18 September 1939.

How do you explain the inconsistency between this documentary evidence and the statement in your affidavit?

A I did not know that fact.

Q Prosecution exhibit 587, page 6,562 of the transcript, is a telegram from Ribbentrop to Ambassador Ott of June 28, 1941, stating that Ribbentrop had obtained an agreement with OSHIMA that he, OSHIMA, will influence Japan towards speedy military action against Russia.

How do you explain the inconsistency between this documentary evidence and the statement in your affidavit?

A I do not know that document. I was still on leave and I returned to work later.

Q You referred in your testimony to a proposal made by the accused SHIGEMITSU to take Russia out of the war with Germany by compromise.

Did that occur after the battle of Midway and Saipan -- and the battle of Saipan?

A I do not remember the dates of these battles. It was at any rate in the second half of August.

Q On page 7, question 10 of the interrogatories, your document 1714--

THE PRESIDENT: Exhibit 2744-A.

Q (Continuing) You state that the conference of 8 July 1940 between Ambassador SATO, KURUSU, you and Ribbentrop was actually no conference, and that you do not recall that any matter relating to the French and Lutch East Asia colonies was discussed and that no matter relating to the interest of Germany in the Pacific was discussed, according to your recollection

Is that statement in your affidavit correct?

A Yes, that statement is correct. I recollect practically nothing what was talked about. I sat

2

, 1

5

4

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

10

12

13

14

15

16

aside and was present, but I knew, of course, the character of the whole visit.

If you do not remember what was talked about, why is it that you say there was no conference?

I say that because it was not planned as conference, and it was no conference. Ambassador SATO was not on any official mission in Germany, and he was announced as an ambassador travelling for Germany as a foreigner of distinction, and Ambassador KURUSU had asked me to try to prepare a visit of this Ambassador SATO meeting with -- visit to -- a courtesy call to the German ambassador.

MR. TAVENNER: The attention of the Tribunal is called to prosecution exhibit 522, page 6,170 of the transcript, for a record of this discussion or conference.

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

10

17.

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

Q On page 11 of your affidavit you state that it was the general idea in 1938 and 1939 to prevent war through forming a defensive alliance. I want to ask you if it was on the 12th day of March, 1938 that German troops marched into Austria --

A Yes, that is right.

Q (Continuing) --- on the 1st day of October,
1938 that the German troops marched into Sudetenland --

A That's right.

Q (Continuing) --- the 15th day of March, 1939 the German troops began occupation of Czechoslovakia?

A Yes.

Q Is it not also true that on April 16, 1939 there was a conference between Goer ing, Mussolini and Count Ciano in Rome, at which Mussolini declared a general war was unavoidable, asked for the most favorable moment, and inquired as to who would sieze the initiative; that Goer ing expressed the opinion that the Axis Powers should still wait a bit, and that it was agreed that the motto for the behavior of both countries should be to speak of peace and to prepare for war? I refer to prosecution exhibit 505, page 6,111 of the transcript. Is that correct?

A As far as the Goer ing conference, I can say nothing; I didn't -- knew nothing about this

conference.

1

2 3

4

6

8

9

10 11

12 13

14

15 16

17 18

19

20

21

22 23

25

You did know that in 1938 and 1939 Germany

had decided to go to war, did you not?

I did not know that Germany had decided at that time to go to war. Nobody had me told.

On the basis of the information you now have, you know that Germany had prepared to go to war in 1939, do you not?

A Now I must believe that a war was prepared.

Then you know that your statement in your affidavit is wrong when you say that it was the general idea in 1938 and 1939 to prevent war by forming a military alliance with Japan --

A That was the idea which we heard from every side with whom we talked, my colleagues and I, and even from our superiors.

Q (Continuing) --- and which you now know and recognize was false.

A Yes.

MR. TAVENNER: I have no further questions. THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Cunningham.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: If the Tribunal please. REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. CUNNINGHAM:

Q Mr. Stahmer, you stated on Monday, in answer to Mr. Blakeney's question, that you acted in August and September, 1938 as liaison between Ribbentrop and OSHIMA, the then Japanese military attache in Berlin, in a negotiation for a German-Japanese agreement. What was the nature of this negotiation?

A As far as I remember, there were at that time only preliminary talks about the possibility of a closer understanding between Germany and Japan, and Ribbentrop wanted to know what the Japanese Army was thinking.

Q And did Ribbentrop ask you to determine the intention of the Japanese Army by taking the matter up with OSHIMA?

A Yes, we talked together.

Q Did you or Ribbentrop get an answer from OSHINA to your inquiry as to the intention of the Japanese Army?

MR. TAVENNER: If the Tribunal please, I do not see how this is any matter arising out of cross-examination.

THE PRESIDENT: Nor can we, but Mr. Cunning-

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

18

19

20

21

22

24

.

ham may convince us that it does.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: For this purpose, may we consider the examination of Mr. Blakeney as cross-examination and direct examination in respect to it?

THE PRESIDENT: As the rules say, Mr. Blakeney's examination and other examinations by the defense counsel is direct.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Yes. We will pursue the matter through another witness on that question.

Q Much was said of the telegram that you and Ott sent from Tokyo to Perlin on the 23rd of February, 1940, exhibit 511, and I ask you to help me clarify some confusion. It is stated in this telegram that "I found such Japanese already known to me, as OSHIMA, SHIRATORI, TERAUCHI, ISHII, and so forth, in an unchanged, friendly attitude and ready for every support." Is this a statement or summary of your personal opinion, or was this a reiteration of what you heard from them?

A That was my personal opinion and the impression I got from my conversation with these gentlemen who were all known as pro-German, of course.

Q Did you talk with any of these people concerning the alliance of Germany and Japan at that time?

A No, because at that time there was no possi-

4

7

0

10

12

14

16

n

17 18 19

22

20

21

23

25

bility. I had at that time given up any hope, and I avoided that talk on that line.

Q Did any of these Japanese, including OSHIMA and SHIRATORI, express any readiness to you at that time to support an alliance with Germany?

A No, no.

THE PRESIDENT: We will recess for fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1445, a recess was taken until 1500, after which the proceed-ings were resumed as follows:)

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Cunningham.

BY MR. CUNNINGHAM (Continued):

question by Mr. Tavenner that you know the contents of the telegram in exhibit 508, which was discovered in the files of the German Embassy when you took over the Embassy in 1943. Did you ever investigate whether or not OSHIMA conducted any correspondence with Ribbentrop through the German Embassy in Tokyo or not?

A Yes, I ordered my personal secretary, Mr.

Klimek, Secretary of Legation, to investigate whoseever could send letters or cables via the German Embassy

with or without use of the cipher code.

Q From your investigation did you determine whether or not Mr. OSHIMA had ever exercised the privilege described in that telegram?

A I heard this after his investigation, that OSHIMA had never sent any telegram or letter using these possibilities.

Q You state that Ambassador OSHIMA was popular with the German people. Can you give us the reasons why you state that?

Tribunal please, on the ground that was not the witness's statement. The question relates to the German Army and Hitler -- not the German people.

Q Well, I will change that to read, "in Germany." Will you give us the background for that, please?

A OSHIMA was very well liked in Germany everywhere. He was very sociable. He spoke very good German, and he made a good appearance; and he was a very good host and invited many people in his Erbassy to enjoy his hospitality.

Q Do you know whether or not OSHIMA resigned as Ambassador in September, 1939, after the Russian-German Non-Aggression Pact?

A I do not know.

background for a document which we wish to introduce as an exhibit, and to show the participants in the negotiations on the Tri-Partite Pact which have been described to this witness, I ask that the witness be shown defense document 1664 for identification purposes.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Tavenner.

objection is made to the attempt to introduce a document in redirect examination.

THE PRESIDENT: That alone could be no ground for objection. It would be possible to get in a document on redirect examination, but whether this document can be got in is another question.

MR. TAVENNEN: I had not completed my statement, "which is not based upon any evidence in crossexamination."

and without Nr. Cunningham's help I cannot see how any question put in cross-examination or how the answer given in cross-examination could justify the admission of a document like this, a photograph, in re-examination.

IR. CUMNINGHAM: Well, I don't remember saying

6

1

2

3

4

5

.000

9

10

11

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

A I do not know.

background for a document which we wish to introduce as an exhibit, and to show the participants in the negotiations on the Tri-Partite Pact which have been described to this witness, I ask that the witness be shown defense document 1664 for identification purposes.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Tavenner.

objection is made to the attempt to introduce a document in redirect examination.

THE PRESIDENT: That alone could be no ground for objection. It would be possible to get in a document on redirect examination, but whether this document can be got in is another question.

ment, "which is not based upon any evidence in crossexamination."

and without Mr. Cunningham's help I cannot see how any question put in cross-examination or how the answer given in cross-examination could justify the admission of a document like this, a photograph, in re-examination.

MR. CUMMINGHAM: Well, I don't remember saying

4

1

2

3

7

6

.

9

10

4.2

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

that I was offering it as part of the re-examination.

I am only offering it for identification so that I
can offer it later as an exhibit.

THE PRESIDENT: Without our permission you are there to conduct only a redirect examination.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, I am sorry. I will do that later.

I did have a couple more questions to propound, your Honor.

Q On this description of the SATO-KURUSU luncheon you failed to mention the man's name who made the report -- Mr. Knoll, I believe. Can you tell us of his title, his responsibility, and whether or not he was in a position of authority to negotiate for the German Government on any kind of political matter?

A I do not remember his name and I do not know his position, but I remember that a Minister KAWAI was present there, who was in Berlin sometime beforehand, and I told Ribbentrop because it was a courtesy visit to use this opportunity and invite Mr. KAWAI, too. Of course, Ribbentrop at first says he has no time for such visits.

Q Well, identify that document as exhibit 522, signed by Knoll, or memorandum prepared by Knoll.

-

--

that I was offering it as part of the re-examination.
I am only offering it for identification so that I
can offer it later as an exhibit.

THE PRESIDENT: Without our permission you are there to conduct only a redirect examination.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, I am sorry. I will do that later.

I did have a couple more questions to propound, your Honor.

Q On this description of the SATO-KURUSU luncheon you failed to mention the man's name who made the report -- Mr. Knoll, I believe. Can you tell us of his title, his responsibility, and whether or not he was in a position of authority to negotiate for the German Government on any kind of political matter?

A I do not remember his name and I do not know his position, but I remember that a Minister KAWAI was present there, who was in Berlin sometime beforehand, and I told Ribbentrop because it was a courtesy visit to use this opportunity and invite Mr. KAWAI, too. Of course, Ribbentrop at first says he has no time for such visits.

Q Well, identify that document as exhibit 522, signed by Knoll, or memorandum prepared by Knoll.

7 8

that I was offering it as part of the re-examination.

I am only offering it for identification so that I
can offer it later as an exhibit.

THE PRESIDENT: Without our permission you are there to conduct only a redirect examination.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, I am sorry. I will do that later.

I did have a couple more questions to propound, your Honor.

Q On this description of the SATO-KURUSU luncheon you failed to mention the man's name who made the report -- Mr. Knoll, I believe. Can you tell us of his title, his responsibility, and whether or not he was in a position of authority to negotiate for the German Government on any kind of political matter?

A I do not remember his name and I do not know his position, but I remember that a Minister KAWAI was present there, who was in Berlin sometime beforehand, and I told Ribbentrop because it was a courtesy visit to use this opportunity and invite Mr. KAWAI, too. Of course, Ribbentrop at first says he has no time for such visits.

Q Well, identify that document as exhibit 522, signed by Knoll, or memorandum prepared by Knoll.

Now, Mr. Stahmer, there seems to be some discrepancy between the interpretation of the Tribunal and the interpretation of the prosecution on the question, the application of count 5 of the Indictment on the attitude of Germany and Japan toward the other nations of the world and toward the individuals.

 MR. TAVENNER: If the Tribunal please, I object to this type of a statement being made by counsel and suggest that it is only proper for him to examine the witness and not to make statements of the character he has made.

THE PRESIDENT: Judging from what we have heard from Mr. Cunningham this witness has been asked to arbitrate between the Court and the prosecution.

We will let Mr. Cunningham complete what he has to say.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Your Honor has suggested that you are perhaps interested in Ribbentrop's and Hitler's attitude toward the other countries of the world because they are involved perhaps as divers other persons contained in the conspiracy, whereas the prosecution has stated that they are not interested in Germany's attitude toward the other nations of the world. I would like to clarify the distinction by asking this witness if the attitude expressed in his affidavit of Germany toward the other nations of the world was also Von Ribbentrop's and Hitler's attitude as well as the attitude of the German government and then proceed.

THE PRESIDENT: We do not desire the witness' assistance on such a matter.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Your Honor, then may I take it as a statement of the law of this case that--

2

4

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

25

THE PRESIDENT: You take nothing except listen to our decision and abide by it. We do not want any dissertation from you.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I did have some further questions along this line on the attitude of the German leaders towards the other nations of the world in refutation of the charge of the prosecution that these three nations started out to dominate the world under a conspiracy but in the light--

THE PRESIDENT: We do not want him to swear what may well be an issue.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: That concludes the redirect examination of this witness and I ask that this witness be released permanently as he is expected to leave Japan for his homeland soon.

THE PRESIDENT: He is released on the usual terms.

(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)
THE PRESIDENT: General Vasiliev.

GENERAL VASILIEV: If the Court please, before the midday recess the Tribunal announced its judgment and order as to the application of defense counsel for the production of witnesses for cross-examination whose affidavits were presented in the Soviet phase. The first item of the judgment and order says that the affidavits of Semyonov and Rodzaevsky will be disregarded, in other words excluded, if I understand it correctly.

I have carefully reread the application of the defense (Mr. Blakeney's statement on June 9, pages 23,788-23,805 of the record) and could find no application of the defense for the exclusion of the affidavits of Semyonov and Rodzaevsky. Mr. Blakeney said: "I therefore respectfully renew our often made motion that the witnesses be ordered produced for crossexamination or their testimony stricken from the record and disregarded for all purposes."

It is true that in his application Mr. Blakeney mentioned the affidavits of Semyonov and Rodzaevsky but on page 23,803 of the record, but Mr. President made a remark (pages 23,803-23,804 of the record) that "Major Blakeney, as regards those men who are dead and can't be called for cross-examination, you could deal with their case in your summation, but not now. We are now about to determine what if any witnesses who are still living should be called for cross-examination."

Continuing the idea contained in Mr. President's words I should like to say that for the defense it is a matter for summation while for the Tribunal it is a matter for the final judgment.

In accordance with that, in my reply I did not deal with the witnesses who are not living; consequently the Tribunal made its decision without giving me an opportunity of stating my views on such an important matter. With all due respect for the Tribunal I must express my deep surprise at this decision also on the following grounds:

When the prosecution tendered the affidavits of Semyonov and Rodzaevsky (the first one on October 8, 1946 and the second on October 11, 1946), the Court was well informed that those witnesses were dead and the defense based their objections on that assumption, but the objections were overruled and the affidavits were admitted without any reservations (page 7319 of the record). That decision was the decision of the majority of the Tribunal and in reply to the repeated objection of the defense Mr. President stated: "The decision disposes of all objections raised." (Page 7319 of the record).

Thus the question of the admissibility of Semyonov's affidavit was not left open. The affidavit of Rodzaevsky was also admitted (page 7603 of the record). Now a decision to the contrary was taken which has no procedural grounds and is the more embarrassing as no reasons for it are given and the other party say the

prosecution was deprived of the opportunity of stating its views.

The last portion of the decision relates to the attack made by Mr. Blakeney against the USSR. The handling of this question in the decision amounts to finding out whether or not Mr. Blakeney had any evidence concerning the duress allegedly employed by us on the witnesses. I carefully looked through the transcript once more and was unable to find in Mr. Blakeney's words (page 23,191) anything else except his offensive remarks, "iron curtain," "a man with the gun in his back." It appears that all that it amounts to is that Mr. Blakeney did not produce evidence to corroborate that horrible picture depicted by his imagination that it actually took place.

With all due respect for the Tribunal I can't apply to myself the warning of the Tribunal addressed to both sides because in no case have we allowed ourselves to attack any nation or to make any attacks upon any of the defense counsel, but I have repeatedly heard attacks directed by the defense counsel against my country. Unfortunately the present decision is no adequate measure of combating such attacks and presents the matter as though these attacks are of reciprocal nature.

"olf & Kapleau

THE PRESIDENT: The decisions of the Court must, of course, be accepted by counsel on both sides without any question. The decision this morning, I should say, was a decision of the majority. No decision of this Tribunal has received more consideration than that decision received. "e considered all the matters to which you referred, General Vasiliev. That was the only determination that was satisfactory in the view of a majority, a substantial majority.

The remark of Major Blakeney called for the decision that the Court arrived at and embodied in the memorandum read this morning. "e resent any gratuitous, unwarranted attack on any of the Allied Powers. "e can say no more than that.

Mr. Cunningham.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: If the Tribunal please, I now offer defense document 1656 for identification and tender excerpts therefrom, defense document 1656 A to AD, for evidence. This is an official top-secret document of the Japanese Foreign Office entitled "Outline of the Process of Drafting Various Drafts Concerning the Tripartite Pact of Japan, Germany, and Italy, and Pertaining Documents." This document was compiled by Mr. MATSUMOTO, Director of the Treaty Department of the Foreign Office at the time of the conclusion

of the Pact, and show that no aggressive intention was expressed by any party during the negotiations.

Annex 1 to 20 are marked as B to Z and AA to AD. I do not wish to read the annexes, but I do specifically ask the Tribunal to consider them in their consideration of the Tripartite Pact. I only offer to read the first two pages, or the outline of the negotiations.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: May it please the Tribunal, the prosecution would not object to these documents if they were as my friend describes and were arranged in an intelligible manner. We have only my friend's word for it that the document numbered 1656-A was compiled by MATSUMOTO and was compiled contemporaneously. The copy served upon me shows no signature, no date, and no certificate. Furthermore, the annexes numbered 1 to 20, referred to in that document, are newhere identified in the accompanying documents except one or, by possible inference, two. They include a mass of repetition and it is impossible to discover, for instance, a very important point: Thich of the draft letters alleged to have been attached to the Pact was the one which was ultimately signed?

If the defense will take this bundle of docu-

r. ..

ments away and get it into proper order, we shall probably have no objection, but in its present form it is open to all the objections I have mentioned.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Cunningham.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, your Honor, I think anybody who takes this document and reads it in the order in which it has been arranged will have no difficulty. That is the way I understand it. As I understand it, the documents are arranged in exactly the same way they are arranged in the book from which they were taken.

THE PRESIDENT: Is the book certified to in the usual way?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: The book is an official document book of the Japanese Foreign Office, with the certificate attached.

THE PRESIDENT: We are not insisting on copies if the certificates be given to us, but we do want to be satisfied that these things are authenticated as far as they can be. Have you looked at the original, Mr. Carr?

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, I haven't seen the original. The person who is alleged to have prepared the summery is alive, and surely it must be possible for the defense to get him to show, if the

,

book does not show, which of the various attached documents are the numbered annexes referred to in the summary.

There has been served upon us with the document a mysterious note, which has obviously been recently compiled and is not part of the document, but which
only makes confusion worse confounded. I would suggest
that the defense would be wise to adopt the proposal
I made, that they should have the annexes properly
identified to the summary, and then it might be a convenient and useful document.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, your Honor, I had the man who compiled the book the other day and he was rejected because his affidavit was not in proper form. But the book certainly ought to be the best evidence of what was said, not what the author says he said.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Carr's objection can be very readily met, Mr. Cunningham, by a short certification in a document or by some individual called here. In a matter of this magnitude we naturally look for complete authenticity.

IR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, I don't know what more I can do. I offered the man who wrote the book, I offered the book in three languages, and I offered a certificate by the party responsible for the control

and custody of the book, and I offered the copies from the books, which give it also in the order in which it appears in the book. I wonder what more I can do.

THE PRESIDENT: There is only one thing you haven't done, Mr. Cunningham, that is, observe the rules. My colleagues are perusing these documents and they find that important dates are omitted, opinions are given and the names of persons responsible do not appear. Things like that make these documents useless.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, I have now had an opportunity of looking at the original book, and I find that what appears from what has been siad to be the parent document, 1656-A, does not appear in the book in English at all. Some Japanese is shown to me which I am informed is the Japanese of this. The book does not appear to identify any of what is alleged to be the annexes to the summary. I can only repeat my suggestion that they should be properly identified and then the thing might be useful.

THE PRESIDENT: I do not understand a word or a letter even of the original, which is handed to me, seeing it is in Japanese.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, your Honor, there was a purpose in translating it so that we would each have the English of it, and the English trans-lation is in our hands in the order in which it

appears in your book. But, I will be glad to comply with anything you have to suggest about how it would be acceptable.

THE PRESIDENT: Call Mr. MATSUMOTO to certify these things. That is the shortest way.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Will his oral testimony of identification be sufficient?

THE PRESIDENT: The rules must be observed, the simple rules. A child can follow them and apply them. We need an affidavit.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Your Honor, may I ask about, say, the revision of the affidavits? We offered Mr. MATSUMOTO's affidavit the other day, and you know it is difficult to revise them and give 3 days and still copy the continuity. Does your rule say that we have to serve a revised affidavit in 3 days, or the original affidavit as revised, and cover the 3-day period in the original service?

THE PRESIDENT: It is the first time in my experience that I have heard a court asked whether its published rules do this or do that. You read our rules and if you have any doubt about them, maybe you can have that doubt discussed and perhaps removed, if one exists.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I now offer defense document

1 613 for identification, Interrogation of the late 2 MATSUOKA, Yosuke, by the International Prosecution 3 Section at Sugamo for identification, and tender excerpts therefrom, defense document 613-A, 10-13 and 2 for evidence. 6 Now, I am not sure whether your Honors have decided on whether or not to accept MATSUOKA's interrogation, but they come in logical order now, and I would like to know if there is a ruling on it. 10 THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Carr. 11 MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, the position as far as I recollect it is, certainly on the first occasion, when an excerpt from MATSUOKA's interrogation 14 was tendered the Tribunal rejected it on my objection that the only basis or justification for using a 16 part of this interrogation could be that the prosecution 17 had used a part of it and therefore that the defense was entitled to do so; and, as the prosecution did 19 not use any part of MATSUOKA's interrogation, I successfully objected to the defense doing so. THE PRESIDENT: We have fully considered 22 that matter, and by a majority we came to the conclusion that the interrogation of any of the accused can be used for or against himself only. That is what it amounts to. Of course, where one of the

20

other accused heard what he said and admitted its truth, it could be used against him. But, we know of no such case yet. MR. COMYNS CARR: MATSUOKA no longer being amongst the accused I assume the ruling means that his interrogation cannot be used by either side. THE PRESIDENT: That is the Court's decision 7 and we will hear no discussion about it. 8 MR. CUNNINGHAM: Will the reporter read what the President said? I didn't hear it. 10 (Whereupon, the statement of the 11 President was read by the official court 12 13 reporter.) THE PRESIDENT: We will adjourn now until 14 15 half-past nine tomorrow morning. 16 (Whereupon, at 1600, an adjournment 17 was taken until Wednesday, 18 June, 1947, at 18 0930.) 19 20 21 22 23 24 25